



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/390,154	09/03/1999	RAJAT MUKHERJEE	AM9-99-0080	6393

7590 03/29/2002  
JOHN L ROGITZ  
ROGITZ & ASSOCIATES  
750 B STREET SUITE 3120  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER	
LY, ANH	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/390,154

Applicant(s)

MUKHERJEE, RAJAT

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2172

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Claim 9 has been cancelled.
3. Claim 1-8 and 10-20 are pending in this application.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 12, the first line of claim 11, --The method of claim 10-- should be read as "The system of claim 10". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,035,330 issued to Astiz et al. (hereinafter as Astiz) in view of US Patent No. 5,974,455 issued to Monier.

Art Unit: 2172

With respect to claim 1, Astiz discloses storing data representative of the assets and hyperlinks in a database (col. 7, lines 48-67 and col. 10, lines 50-67); and using the database, ensuring that when a user browser selects a hyperlink represented in the database, the user is not presented with a "file not found" message (col. 11, lines 58-67 and col. 12, lines 1-14).

Astiz does not explicitly indicate, "crawling the Web servers to identify assets and hyperlinks therein."

However, Monier discloses crawling the web servers to identify assets and hyperlink as claimed (abstract, col. 3, lines 1-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Astiz with the teachings of Monier so as to obtain a computer system for managing assets on plurality of web servers because the combination would let the users to select a hypertext document in the database from which the web browser would not return an error message or "file not found message because the combination would provide the method for managing assets on plurality of web servers enable to provide the navigational map to the users (Astiz – col. 5, lines 22-38) in the information retrieval via computer network over the Internet environment.

With respect to claim 2, Astiz discloses determining that any hyperlink is a broken hyperlink when the hyperlink points to an asset not represented in the database;

Art Unit: 2172

undertaking action to address broken hyperlinks, the integrity of the hyperlinks being preserved once the hyperlinks are addressed (col. 3, lines 39-53, col. 4, lines 12-22, col. 11, lines 59-67 and col. 12, lines 1-54).

With respect to claim 3, Astiz discloses wherein the undertaking act includes modifying an asset on the Web server or adding an asset to the Web server such that when a user browser selects a hyperlink in an asset on one of the Web servers, the user is not presented with a 'file not found' message (col. 3, lines 39-53, col. 4, lines 12-37, col. 11, lines 59-67 and col. 12, lines 1-54).

With respect to claim 4, Astiz in view of Monier discloses linking the data representative of the assets and hyperlinks resident in the database to the corresponding assets on the Web servers ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3; '455 of see fig. 1, item 110 and col. 4, lines 18-34).

With respect to claim 5, Astiz in view of Monier discloses determining that a user is attempting to create a new asset on one of the Web servers ('455 of see fig. 1, item 110 and col. 4, lines 18-34); receiving the new asset; copying the new asset to a Web server; crawling the new asset to identify assets and hyperlinks therein ('455 of abstract, col. 3, lines 1-64); and storing data representative of the assets and hyperlinks in the database ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 6, Astiz in view of Monier discloses determining that a user is attempting to modify an existing asset in one of the Web servers ('455 of item 110 in fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 18-34); unlinking the existing asset from the database; allowing the user to update the existing asset to render a modified asset, a copy of the existing

Art Unit: 2172

asset being retained ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3); crawling the modified asset to identify assets and hyperlinks therein ('455 of abstract, col. 3, lines 1-64 and col. 4, lines 18-34); storing data representative of the assets and hyperlinks of the modified asset in the database; and relinking the modified asset and existing asset with the database ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 7, Astiz discloses computer readable code means for identifying the assets and for identifying reference pointers in the assets to other assets in the data repository; computer readable code means for determining that a reference pointer is a broken reference pointer when the reference pointer refers to an asset not present in the data repository, such that a system manager can address the broken reference pointers, and the system further comprises: computer readable code means for linking the assets to a database containing metadata representative of the assets and reference pointers, such that backups of the database automatically cause the associated assets to be backed up on the file system or Web servers (col. 2, lines 18-42, col. 3, lines 20-38, col. 4, lines 38-55, col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 8, lines 1-4, col. 9, lines 32-67, col. 10, lines 1-67, col. 11, lines 1-67 and col. 12, lines 1-36: HTML as metadata and web pages as assets).

Astiz does not explicitly indicate, "the data repository includes at least one file system or at least two Web servers."

However, Monier discloses web servers as claimed (see fig. 1, item 110, col. 4, lines 18-34, col. 9, lines 62-67 and col. 10, lines 1-15).

Art Unit: 2172

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Astiz with the teachings of Monier so as to have a computer system for managing assets on plurality of web servers because the combination would let the users to select a hypertext document in the database from which the web browser would not return an error message or "file not found" message because the combination would provide the method for managing assets on plurality of web servers enable to provide the navigational map to the users (Astiz – col. 5, lines 22-38) in the information retrieval via computer network over the Internet environment.

With respect to claim 8, Astiz discloses broken reference pointers are addressed using computer readable code means such that subsequent computer-based selections of the reference pointers are not possible or, if possible, do not result in "file not found" messages (col. 11, lines 59-67 and col. 12, lines 1-56).

With respect to claim 10, Astiz discloses computer readable code means for determining that a user is attempting to create a new asset on one of the Web servers; computer readable code means for receiving the new asset; computer readable code means for copying the new asset to a Web server; computer readable code means for crawling the new asset to identify assets and hyperlinks therein; and computer readable code means for storing data representative of the assets and hyperlinks in the database (col. 2, lines 18-42, col. 3, lines 20-38, col. 10, lines 45-67, col. 11, lines 59-67 and col. 12, lines 1-36).

With respect to claim 11, Astiz in view of Monier discloses computer readable code means for determining that a user is attempting to modify an existing asset in one of the Web servers ('455 of item 110 in fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 18-34); computer readable code means for unlinking the asset from the database; computer readable code means for allowing the user to update the asset to render a modified asset ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3); computer readable code means for crawling the modified asset to identify assets and hyperlinks therein ('455 of abstract, col. 3, lines 1-64 and col. 4, lines 18-34); computer readable code means for storing data representative of the assets and hyperlinks of the modified asset in the database; and computer readable code means for relinking the database with the modified asset ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 12, Astiz in view of Monier discloses crawling the Web server to identify assets and hyperlinks therein ('455 of abstract, col. 3, lines 1-64 and col. 4, lines 18-34); sending metadata representative of the assets and hyperlinks to a database, whereby when a user browser selects a hyperlink represented in the database, the user is never presented with a "file not found" message ('330 col. 10, lines 45-67, col. 11, lines 1-67 and col. 12, lines 1-36).

With respect to claim 13, Astiz in view of Monier discloses determining that a user is attempting to create a new asset the Web server ('455 of see fig. 1, item 110 and col. 4, lines 18-34); receiving the new asset; copying the new asset to a Web server; crawling the new asset to identify assets and hyperlinks therein ('455 of abstract,



Art Unit: 2172

col. 3, lines 1-64); and storing metadata representative of the assets and hyperlinks in the database ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 14, Astiz in view of Monier discloses determining that a user is attempting to modify an existing asset in the Web server ('455 of item 110 in fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 18-34); such that the asset can be unlinked from the database in response; allowing the user to update the asset to render a modified asset ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3); crawling the modified asset to identify assets and hyperlinks therein ('455 of abstract, col. 3, lines 1-64 and col. 4, lines 18-34); sending metadata representative of the assets and hyperlinks of the modified asset in the database, such that the database can be relinked with the modified asset ('330 of col. 7, lines 48-67, col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 15, Astiz in view of Monier discloses receiving, in a database, data representative of assets and hyperlinks from plural Web servers ('455 of see item 110 in fig. 1, col. 4, lines 18-34, col. 6, lines 64-67 and col. 7, lines 18); maintaining the database such that when a user browser selects a hyperlink represented in the database, the user is never presented with a "file not found" message ('330 of col. 11, lines 56-67 and col. 12, lines 1-14).

With respect to claim 16, Astiz discloses determining whether any hyperlink is a 'broken hyperlink when the hyperlink points to an asset not represented in the database; and facilitating action to address broken hyperlinks (col. 10, lines 45-67, col. 11, lines 1-67 and col. 12, lines 1-36).

Art Unit: 2172

With respect to claim 17-18, Astiz in view of Monier discloses linking the data representative of the assets-and hyperlinks resident in the database to the corresponding assets on the Web servers and the database is remote from the Web servers ('455 of col. 4, lines 18-34, col. 9, lines 27-67 and col. 10, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 19, Astiz discloses automatically backing up the assets and hyperlinks when the database is backed up (col. 10, lines 45-67, col. 11, lines 1-67 and col. 12, lines 15-36).

With respect to claim 20, Astiz in view of Monier discloses automatically covering backed up assets and hyperlinks to their respective Web servers when the database is recovered ('330 of col. 10, lines 45-67, col. 11, lines 1-67 and col. 12, lines 15-36; '455 of col. 4, lines 18-34, col. 9, lines 27-67 and col. 10, lines 1-15).

### **Contact Information**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (703) 306-4527. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, see the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2172

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238 (after Final Communication)

or:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:


(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please

label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

AL 

  
KIM VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mar. 12<sup>th</sup>, 2002.